

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated July 14, 2009, claims 21-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 were previously canceled. Claim 22 is amended to further clarify the claim as requested by the Office Action, based on the rejection made under U.S.C 112. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103

Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Norcott et al. and further in view of Ahmad et al. and Fish et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, independent claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

- “A system for managing the display of media on a plurality of media systems of a facility, the system comprising:
- a data stream source operable to store audio-visual files in digital format;
 - a first decoder in communication with the data stream source and operable to receive a first audio-visual file selected from the audio-visual files, the first decoder further operable to convert the first audio-visual file into a first analog signal;
 - a second decoder in communication with the data stream source and operable to receive a second audio-visual file selected from the audio-visual files, the first decoder further operable to convert the second audio-visual file into a second analog signal;
 - a controller in communication with the first and second decoders and operable to select the first audio-visual file, the selection of the first audio-visual file being made in response to the controller communicating with the first decoder using an infrared signal, the controller being further operable to select a second audio-visual file, the selection of the second audio-visual file being made in response to the controller communicating with the second decoder using an infrared signal;
 - a first modulator in communication with the first decoder and operable to receive the first analog signal and modulate the first analog signal for communication over a first coaxial cable; and
 - a second modulator in communication with the second decoder and operable to receive the second analog signal and modulate the second analog signal for communication over a second coaxial cable.

This is clearly unlike Norcott, which fails to suggest, teach or disclose “a first decoder in communication with the data stream source and operable to receive a first audio-visual file selected from the audio-visual files, the first decoder further operable to convert the first audio-visual file into a first analog signal.” Instead, Norcott appears to teach a terminal for a desktop user

Likewise, Ahmad teaches a system containing in-room control module (ICM). The ICM is utilized to receive requests from a user and also tunes to specific channels. (col. 2, lines 12-28). The ICM teaches an intermediary device for receiving and relaying commands, the reference example as shown in FIG. 6 below. Please note that there is no reference to a decoder.



5

but the control board is not a first decoder and second decoder or the other elements of the first decoder and second decoder as asserted above or included in the claim.

Similarly, Norcott does not teach a first modulator and a second modulator the "first modulator in communication with the first decoder and operable to receive the first analog signal and modulate the first analog signal for communication over a first coaxial cable." Because Ahmad does not properly teach a first decoder and a second decoder as shown above, the combination with Norcott is similarly improper. The combination of Norcott and Ahmad also does not teach the first modulator in communication with the first decoder.

The previous Office Actions referencing the combination of Norcott and Fish do not address the controller and corresponding elements as claimed by Applicants. For example, none of the cited references teach the recited elements of claim 21 such as the use of "a controller in communication with the first and second decoders and operable to select the first audio-visual file, the selection of the first audio-visual file being made in response to the controller communicating with the first decoder using an infrared signal, the controller being further operable to select a second audio-visual file, the selection of the second audio-visual file being made in response to the controller communicating with the second decoder using an infrared signal." This defect in the rejection was noted in the previous response. As a result, the current rejection under U.S.C 103 is incomplete.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the finality of the previous Office Action and allow the claims as presently claimed.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, and for other apparent reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action. If the Examiner feels a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

If additional fees are required, please charge our Deposit Account No. 19-3140, under Order No. 11000060-0047 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: Sept. 14, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: Brian D. Owens
Brian D. Owens
Registration No.: 55,517
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
2000 McKinney Ave., Suite 1900
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 259-0900
(214) 259-0910 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants